



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY  
BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF NAVAL RECORDS  
701 S. COURTHOUSE ROAD, SUITE 1001  
ARLINGTON, VA 22204-2490

TJR  
Docket No: 980-14  
July 14, 2014

THE HONORABLE PETER J ROSKAM  
MEMBER UNITED STATES HOUSE  
OF REPRESENTATIVES  
2700 INTERNATIONAL DRIVE SUITE 304  
ATTENTION: MR (b) (6)  
MR (b) (6)  
WEST CHICAGO IL 60185

Dear Congressman Roskam:

This is in response to your recent correspondence of May 28, 2014, and in further response to your letter of January 27, 2014, regarding one of your constituents and a former member of the Navy, Mr. (b) (6).

The Board initially considered and denied Mr. (b) (6) request for corrective action on April 20, 2010. After review of new and material evidence, the Board reconsidered, but again denied his request on March 25, 2014. Copies of the Board's letters informing him of its decisions are attached for your information.

A review of the documentation provided with your recent letter has been made and I found that further reconsideration of Mr. (b) (6) request is not warranted at this time. With that being said, the RE-4 reenlistment code was properly assigned at the time of his discharge.

I regret that a more favorable reply cannot be made. However, your interest in former members of the Naval Service is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

(b) (6)

Acting Executive Director

Enclosures



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY  
BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF NAVAL RECORDS  
701 S. COURTHOUSE ROAD, SUITE 1001  
ARLINGTON, VA 22204-2490

TJR  
Docket No: 980-14  
25 March 2014

(b) (6)

Dear Mr. (b) (6):

This is in reference to your application for correction of your naval record pursuant to the provisions of Title 10, United States Code, Section 1552.

A three-member panel of the Board for Correction of Naval Records, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 25 March 2014. The names and votes of the members of the panel will be furnished upon request. Your allegations of error and injustice were reviewed in accordance with administrative regulations and procedures applicable to the proceedings of this Board. Documentary material considered by the Board consisted of your application, together with all material submitted in support thereof, your naval record, and applicable statutes, regulations, and policies.

After careful and conscientious consideration of the entire record, the Board found the evidence submitted was insufficient to establish the existence of probable material error or injustice.

You enlisted in the Navy, began a period of active duty on 9 June 2006, and served without disciplinary incident. About six months later, in January 2007, after undergoing a psychiatric evaluation, you were diagnosed with a personality disorder and an adjustment disorder. You were subsequently recommended for an expeditious administrative separation. As a result, you were processed for separation by reason of convenience of the government and were not recommended for reenlistment. The discharge authority directed an honorable discharge by reason of convenience of the government due to a diagnosed personality disorder, and on 16 February 2007, while serving in paygrade E-3, you were so discharged and assigned an RE-4 reenlistment code.

Your record reflects that on 25 October 2013 the Naval Discharge Review Board (NDRB) changed your narrative reason for separation to secretarial authority based primarily on your post-service evidence which states, in part, that you do not have a personality disorder. The NDRB also states that you should have

been processed for separation due to the diagnosed adjustment disorder. Nonetheless, this change does not negate the fact that you were correctly diagnosed with both a personality and adjustment disorder by military psychiatric personnel, properly processed for separation due to the diagnosed disorders, and as such, not recommended for retention or reenlistment.

The Board, in its review of your entire record and application, carefully weighed all potentially mitigating factors, such as your post service psychiatric evidence, the NDRB decisional document, and your desire to have your RE-4 reenlistment code changed based on the NDRB decision to change your narrative reason for separation. Nevertheless, the Board concluded these factors were not sufficient to warrant a change in your reenlistment code. The Board concluded that the diagnosed personality and adjustment disorders, as well as the nonrecommendation for retention or reenlistment, were sufficient to support the assignment of an RE-4 reenlistment code. Finally, such a code is authorized by regulatory guidance and normally assigned to Sailors who are serving in paygrade E-3, have not completed a full term of enlistment, and are separated due to the convenience of the government. Accordingly, your application has been denied.

It is regretted that the circumstances of your case are such that favorable action cannot be taken. You are entitled to have the Board reconsider its decision upon submission of new and material evidence or other matter not previously considered by the Board. In this regard, it is important to keep in mind that a presumption of regularity attaches to all official records. Consequently, when applying for a correction of an official naval record, the burden is on the applicant to demonstrate the existence of probable material error or injustice.

Sincerely,

(b) (6)

Acting Executive Director



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY  
BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF NAVAL RECORDS  
2 NAVY ANNEX  
WASHINGTON DC 20370-5100

TJR  
Docket No: 4816-09  
26 April 2010

(b) (6)

Dear Mr. (b) (6):

This is in reference to your application for correction of your naval record pursuant to the provisions of Title 10, United States Code, Section 1552.

A three-member panel of the Board for Correction of Naval Records, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 20 April 2010. The names and votes of the members of the panel will be furnished upon request. Your allegations of error and injustice were reviewed in accordance with administrative regulations and procedures applicable to the proceedings of this Board. Documentary material considered by the Board consisted of your application, together with all material submitted in support thereof, your naval record, and applicable statutes, regulations, and policies.

After careful and conscientious consideration of the entire record, the Board found the evidence submitted was insufficient to establish the existence of probable material error or injustice.

You enlisted in the Navy on 9 June 2006 at age 21 and served without disciplinary incident. The record reflects that in January 2007, after undergoing a psychiatric evaluation, you were diagnosed with a personality disorder and recommended for an expeditious administrative separation.

Subsequently, you were processed for an administrative separation by reason of convenience of the government due to your diagnosed personality disorder. The discharge authority directed an honorable discharge by reason of convenience of the government due to a diagnosed personality disorder, and on 16 February 2007, you were so discharged and were assigned an RE-4 reenlistment code.

The Board, in its review of your entire record and application, carefully weighed all potentially mitigating factors, such as your youth and desire to change the narrative reason for separation and reenlistment code. Nevertheless, the Board concluded these factors were not sufficient to warrant changes in the narrative reason for separation or reenlistment code because of your diagnosed personality disorder. Finally, the Board found that you did not provide any psychiatric evidence to negate the diagnoses of a personality disorder. Accordingly, your application has been denied.

It is regretted that the circumstances of your case are such that favorable action cannot be taken. You are entitled to have the Board reconsider its decision upon submission of new and material evidence or other matter not previously considered by the Board. In this regard, it is important to keep in mind that a presumption of regularity attaches to all official records. Consequently, when applying for a correction of an official naval record, the burden is on the applicant to demonstrate the existence of probable material error or injustice.

Sincerely,

(b) (6)





DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY  
BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF NAVAL RECORDS  
701 S. COURTHOUSE ROAD, SUITE 1001  
ARLINGTON, VA 22204-2490

March 27, 2014

THE HONORABLE PETER J ROSKAM  
MEMBER UNITED STATES HOUSE  
OF REPRESENTATIVES  
2700 INTERNATIONAL DRIVE SUITE 304  
ATTENTION: MR. (b) (6)  
WEST CHICAGO IL 60185

Dear Congressman Roskam:

This is in response to your letter of January 27, 2014, regarding one of your constituents and a former member of the Navy, Mr. (b) (6).

The Board reconsidered and denied Mr. (b) (6) request for corrective action on March 25, 2014. A copy of my letter informing him of the Board's decision is attached for your information.

I regret that a more favorable reply cannot be made. However, your interest in the former members of the Naval Service is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

(b) (6)

Acting Executive Director

Enclosure